

### REMARKS

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that the Toru reference has been withdrawn in view of the claimed glyconate range. The claims have been amended to a different glyconate range. However, the claims include a limitation that the composition comprises potassium aluminum sulfate, which Toru does not appear to teach. Other dependent claims have additional limitations which make them patentable over the cited art.

Claims 1-80 remain in the application. Claims 46-77 and 80 are withdrawn as directed to the non-elected invention. Claims 1-8, 10, 12-13, 15-25, 27-41, 43-45, 78 and 79 are under active consideration.

Claims 1, 7, 15, 16, 18, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 43-45, and 78 have been amended. Applicants respectfully assert that all amendments are supported by the original disclosure and do not introduce new matter. Moreover, Applicants further respectfully assert that the amendments merely clarify the scope of the claims.

Claim 7 has been amended to include "or" in its proper location.

Multiply dependent claims 16 and 78 have been amended to resemble their original claims but still refer to other claims in the alternative only.

Claims 9, 11, 14, 26, 42, have been cancelled.

#### *Claim Objections*

The Office Action objected to claim 24. Claim 24 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner; "Potassium Sulfate" has been amended to "Potassium Aluminum sulfate."

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph*

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-45, 78, and 79 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 1 has been amended overcome this rejection. Support for the amendment may be found in at least original claim 61.

Support for previously amended claim 3 may be found at least in original claim 60.

Claims 9, 11, 14 has been cancelled.

Support for previously amended claim 10 may be found at least in original claim 62.

Support for previously amended claim 12 may be found at least in original claim 63.

Support for previously amended claim 15 may be found at least in paragraph [0199] of the application.

Support for previously amended claim 21 may be found at least in paragraph [0159] of the application.

Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, have been traversed and removal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph*

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-45, 78, and 79 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Support for the amendment may be found in at least original claim 61. Rejection of claims 1-45, 78, and 79 are now moot in light of this amendment.

Claim 15 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Rejection of claims 29, 78, and 79 are now moot in light of this amendment.

The Office Action rejected claim 16 for insufficient antecedent basis for “the water” in line 2. It is unclear what the Office Action is rejecting because the term “the water” does not appear on line 2 of the claim. The term “the water” appears on line 4 of the claim, but there is antecedent basis for it in claim 16 on line 2. If this rejection is maintained, please provide additional information and suggest appropriate correction.

Claim 18 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

Claim 42 has been cancelled.

Claims 43-45 have been amended. Claim 43 is now an independent claim so it no longer depends from claim 1 and is not limited to the ranges specified in claim 1. Claims 44 and 45 now depend from claim 43.

Claim 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, and 40 have been amended to recite an aqueous solution. This amendment should overcome the rejection. Claims 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, and 41 depend from these claims.

Claim 78 has been amended to overcome the insufficient antecedent basis rejection.


Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, have been traversed and removal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss the amendments or arguments made herein, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at (513) 651-6818 or via e-mail at [srconley@fbtlaw.com](mailto:srconley@fbtlaw.com).

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, including any fees required for an extension of time not already paid for or any other required fees not already paid for, or to credit any overpayment of fees, to Frost Brown Todd LLC Deposit Account No. 06-2226.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jan de Rijk

By   
Scott R. Conley, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 57,289  
FROST BROWN TODD LLC  
3300 Great American Tower  
301 East Fourth Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
(513) 651-6818

2445730v2